



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,794	03/16/2004	Matthew B. MacLaurin	MS305756.01/MSFTP538US	1906
27195	7590	07/09/2007	EXAMINER	
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			HARRISON, CHANTE E	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/801,794	MACLAURIN, MATTHEW B.
	Examiner Chante Harrison	Art Unit 2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-7,18-21,23,24 and 26 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 3,4,8-17,22 and 25 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-16-04

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1,2,5-7, 18-21,23,24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Card et al., US 2005/0273730, 12/2005.

As per independent claim 1, Card discloses a drawing component that determines visible items to a display (pp. 3, Para 37; Fig. 14 “1409”); and a logic component that selectively defers layout of the visible items to the display in a just-in-time manner (i.e. DOI calculation determines degree of interest and enables visualization element t determine which nodes to compress/expand and how) (pp. 3, Para 40-41; pp. 4, Para 46).

As per dependent claim 2, Card discloses the logic component determines complexity of the visible items in order to defer the layout (i.e. DOI calculation determines node

distance in order to determine compressed or expanded visualization of nodes) (pp. 3, Para 40-41; pp. 4, Para 46).

As per dependent claim 5, Card discloses a rough layout component to determine an approximation for the visible items (i.e. sizing and layout of nodes is based on the DOI value) (pp. 4, Para 46).

As per dependent claim 6, Card discloses a final layout component that renders the visible items to the display (Fig. 14 "1409, 1411").

As per dependent claim 7, Card discloses the visible items are associated with subcomponents or children elements appearing within the visible items (i.e. child nodes representing web pages, hypertext links, etc.) (pp. 3, Para 33).

As per dependent claim 18, Card discloses at least one application, the application including at least one of a user interface component, a CAD system, a software development system, a modeling system, a drawing system, and a diagrammatic system (Fig. 3 & 13; pp. 3, Para 34).

As per independent claim 19, Card discloses a computer readable medium (pp. 3, Para 34) for implementation in the system of claim 1. Therefore the rationale as applied in the rejection of claim 1 applies herein.

As per independent claim 20, Card discloses means for processing a set of display items; means for determining a complexity value for the display items (i.e. DOI calculation determines node distance in order to determine compressed or expanded visualization of nodes) (pp. 3, Para 40-41; pp. 4, Para 46); and means for rendering the display items based in part on the complexity value (Fig. 14 "1409").

As per independent claim 21, Card discloses determining a rough layout for a collection of information items (i.e. visualization element determines sizing and layout of nodes based on the DOI value) (pp. 4, Para 46); tagging items from the collection for immediate display (i.e. the control panel indicates which nodes to display based on DOI value, size, etc.) (pp. 8, Para 107-109); and selectively tagging remaining items from the collection for display at a later time (i.e. items having DOI value below a predetermined threshold are not initially displayed) (pp. 4, Para 49).

As per dependent claim 23, Card discloses the Rough Layout is invoked for components and subcomponent to be displayed (Fig. 3; pp. 3, Para 37), wherein an

approximate representation of a size of individual components and subcomponents is calculated (pp. 3, Para 40-41; pp. 4, Para 46, 48).

As per dependent claim 24, the rationale as applied in the rejection of claim 2 applies herein.

As per independent claim 26, Card discloses at least one display object for displaying contents of an information item (Fig. 9); and at least one layout function that selectively renders the display object based upon a determined graphical complexity associated with the information item (i.e. visualization element determines sizing and layout of nodes based on the DOI value) (pp. 4, Para 46).

1. Claims 3, 4, 8-11, 12-17, 22 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chante Harrison whose telephone number is 571-272-7659. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on 571-272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Chante Harrison
Examiner
Art Unit 2628

Ch
June 22, 2007

Chante Harrison